



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/686,956	10/15/2003	Mitch Fredrick Singer	113748-4837US	8803

27189 7590 08/05/2010
PROCOPIO, CORY, HARGREAVES & SAVITCH LLP
525 B STREET
SUITE 2200
SAN DIEGO, CA 92101

EXAMINER

DUNN, DARRIN D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2121

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

08/05/2010

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docketing@procopio.com
PTONotifications@procopio.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/686,956	Applicant(s) SINGER ET AL.	
	Examiner DARRIN DUNN	Art Unit 2121	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 May 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 5-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 5-39 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. The Office Action is responsive to the communication filed on 05/05/2010.
2. Claims 1-3 and 5-39 are pending in the application.

Response to Amendment

3. The amendment, filed 05/05/2010, is fully responsive and has been entered.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-3 and 5-39 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. However, as per applicant's arguments with regard to 'discrete instance,' the interpretation has been accorded the meaning defined by the applicant. The following is the Examiner's interpretation of 'discrete instance.'

Claim Interpretation

5. Applicant has defined a 'discrete instance' to mean content that is not bound to any hub network and can be moved from one device to another, in or out of the hub network, using compliant media. Applicant's arguments also articulate a 'discrete instance' as being independent of any hub network and can be played or presented through any compliant device (page 16, applicant's arguments). The terminology 'not bound' is interpreted as being independent of the hub network. Independent is interpreted as not subject to control (<http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/independent>). In the present case, as discussed below, content will be transferred to another device as in the case of transferring rights or selling

Art Unit: 2121

the content to another entity. Upon doing so, prior copies of the original content will be disabled via revoking licenses for this content via a license server. A new license for the transferred content is defined that does not associate the transferred content with the prior domain. In effect, the transferred content is no longer bound to the prior network, prior copies are disabled via using a license server to disable all licenses for any copies made, and the transferred content's license may be modified to be independent of any domain, i.e., usage rights do not include domain access. In effect, the content is no longer subject to control of the prior domain (e.g., independent or not bound) because the content a) has been sold b) prior licenses for the original content disabled and c) a new license does not affiliate the content with the prior domain.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Art Unit: 2121

6. Claims 1-3 and 5-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Messerges et al. (USPN 20020157002) in view over Foster et al. (USPN 20030198351) in view over Chase et al. (USPN 20030187801) and in further view over Yaacovi (USPN 20030018582)

7. As per claim 1, Messerges et al. teaches a method of presenting content data, comprising:
receiving at a server device ([0042], [0054] e.g., domain authority, content provider, or other entity) a present request indicating locked content data ([0042] e.g., content package) from a client ([0050] e.g. user device) connected to a hub network ([Figure 2]);

checking a license corresponding to said locked content data to determine if said license permits said client to present said locked content data ([0049], [0060-61] e.g., verifying the package's rights document, hash, and encoded rights table),

wherein said locked content data is a bound instance if said license permits presentation of said locked content data by said client connected to the hub network ([0060-63], [0037-38], [0040], [Figure 4], [Figure 7] e.g., all devices registered to a domain will be interconnected in that they will have access to content within the domain. As understood, a license associated with the network permits rendering of the content within the network), and

wherein the bound instance of said locked content data and the license corresponding to said locked content data are bound to the hub network ([0060-63], [0037-38], [0040], e.g., as interpreted, content that is subject to control of the network is bound. In the present case, content is rendered using a license within the domain, Moreover, as discussed below, a license may be removed via a license server based on selling content, and therefore is also subject to control or bound to the network/domain); and

Art Unit: 2121

presenting said locked content data through a presentation component connected to said client when said locked content data is a bound instance ([0059-63], [Figure 3] e.g., before content may be played, the content manager invokes the core digital rights management software)

However, Messerges et al. does not teach the following limitations:

1] wherein the server device is configured to set up the hub network including adding the client and the server device to the hub network.

2] wherein the server device is configured to function as a client in the hub network, and

3] wherein said locked content data is stored on the server device connected to the hub network

Foster et al. teaches 1] ([0080 lines 1-10] e.g., existing devices are both servers and authorizers. Authorizers are configured to authorize the addition of the new device.)

2] ([0080 line 9-11] e.g., sharing and distributing data, i.e., server may render content in the same manner as the client because devices are both authorizers and servers. It is understood that a participating device may render content. Since a device may be a server, it is understood that a server acts as a client (e.g., another device) because its is operable to play content in the same way as another device. It is interpreted that sharing a common function between a server and client enables a server to act as a client)

3] ([0078], [0080] lines 9-11] e.g., content is freely shared among devices, wherein a device may be a server and authorizer)

Therefore, at the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have motivation to modify Messerges as to enable participating devices to function as a server and client, control how many devices are added to the network, and control how content is distributed within the network. The motivation is to implement the teachings of Foster et al. to

Art Unit: 2121

localize content distribution opposed to requiring a client device to contact an external source for content, as per Messerges. Thus, it is obvious to make integral (e.g., adding, distributing, and authorizing content) content distribution with that of a local network).

However, Messerges et al., as modified, does not teach a) wherein said locked content data is changed to a discrete instance when said locked content data is to be moved to another server device bound to another hub network and b) the server device sends a disable request for the locked content data to clients of the hub network to indicate that the bound instance of the locked content data is changed to the discrete instance c) the disable request causes licenses corresponding to the locked content data to be disabled.

Messerges et al. does teach the limitation of when said locked content data is to be moved to another server device bound to another hub network (see Fosters, [0079] e.g., obvious to relocate content to another domain. However, the copy will be disabled, see below, until rights are established via a source for that copy. As applied, a copy would be operable to be bound to another network by requesting such content to be bound, as per the teachings of Messerges, [0037] e.g., binding content to a particular domain);

Claim Limitation part b): *Disable request causes the license corresponding to the locked content data to be disabled*

Chase et al. teaches a license server configured to disable all licenses issued to a user's computing device ([0020], [0279], [0283]. Yaacovi teaches revocation of the original license as a condition of a sale of content whereby such content is stored on a medium ([0011], [0004], [0053]) Messerges et al. teaches multiple user computing devices storing content ([Figure 4]). Messerges et al. further teaches a license file as part of the content package ([Figure 7])

Art Unit: 2121

Therefore, at the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have motivation to modify Messerges et al. to permit selling content to another user and disabling all original licenses for the content via a license server. Messerges et al. teaches providing copies of content to multiple domain devices ([Figure 4]). Messerges et al. teaches providing a license file per content package. As applied, it is obvious that a license server would disable the licenses for computing devices containing protected content upon the original copy being sold or transferred.

Claim Limitation part a) *said locked content data is changed to a discrete instance when said locked content data is to be moved to another server device bound to another hub network.*

As modified, the content has been transferred, as per Yaacovi, and all licenses for the original content revoked, as per Chase et al. However, this combination does not address whether or not the transferred content is a 'discrete instance.' As interpreted, supra claim interpretation, a license is granted that does not associate any domain to the content would be considered domain independent. Chase et al. teaches a license not associated with a domain, i.e., license rights pertaining to distributing content and/or copying ([0004], [0005] e.g., license rights are silent as to a domain)

Therefore, at the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have motivation to define a license right independent of any domain. A skilled artisan could readily define the type of rights associated with a license including (but not limited) to copy, distribution, and /or what devices may render the content. In effect, upon transferring or selling an original to another user, a content owner, as per Chase et al., has the ability to define what

Art Unit: 2121

rights the recipient may receive. In the present case, the rights are silent as to an association with a domain. Furthermore, the transferred content is not subject to control of the prior domain based on a) revoking all prior licenses b) selling the content to another entity and c) a license is silent with regard to any prior association with the originator's domain.

8. As per claim 2, Messerges et al. teaches the method of claim 1, wherein: said locked content data and said license corresponding to said locked content data are stored on a the server device ([0042-49] e.g., requested content is provided from a content provider. The requested content, as part of the content package, further includes an electronic rights table, a rights document, encrypted content....The objects of the content package may optionally be provided by two files – a license file, encoded rights table, and an encrypted content, etc. As modified by Foster, such locked content would be stored on a participating device that functions as both a server and authorizer, supra Foster [COL [0080]))

9. As per claim 3, Messerges et al. teaches the method of claim 2, wherein: presenting said locked content data includes decrypting said locked content data to produce output content data and sending said output content data to said presentation component ([0060-62])

10. As per claim 5, Messerges et al. teaches the method of claim 1, wherein: checking said license includes sending a confirm license request to said server from said client ([0060-61] e.g., a content package is opened via verifying the package's rights document, hash, and encoded rights table....As applied to Foster, a server| authorizer device includes the aforementioned function of checking a license prior to distributing content to the participating device)

Art Unit: 2121

11. As per claim 6, Messerges et al. teaches the method of claim 5, wherein: presenting said locked content data includes receiving output content data streamed from said server device to said client ([0062] e.g., streaming content)

12. As per claim 7, Messerges et al. teaches the method of claim 5, further comprising: checking a revocation list to determine whether said client is included in said revocation list ([0073], [0029], [0063-64], e.g., revocation list may be provided via a web server application); wherein said revocation list indicates devices for which the license has been revoked, and wherein said revocation list is stored on said server device ([0073] e.g., this functionality may be provided via a web server. As applied, to Foster, a participating device functions as both server and authorizer. It is obvious to incorporate the functions of an external server, as per Messerges, into the device server|authorizer, as per Foster)

13. As per claim 8, Messerges et al. teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising: checking a revocation list to determine whether said client is included in said revocation list ([0029], [0063-64]);

wherein said revocation list indicates devices for which the license has been revoked, and wherein said revocation list is stored on said client ([0074], [Figure 11- element 1110])

14. As per claim 9, Messerges et al. teaches the method of claim 1, wherein: said locked content data is media data ([0031])

15. As per claim 10, Messerges et al. teaches the method of claim 1, wherein: said presentation component is integral to said client ([Figure 3- phones including a display])

Art Unit: 2121

16. As per claim 11, Messerges et al. teaches the method of claim 1, wherein: said presentation component is external to said client ([Figure 3- phones include an integrated, external display])

17. As per claim 12, Messerges et al. teaches the method of claim 1, wherein: said presentation component includes a television ([0003], [0040], [Figure 5- set-top box])

18. As per claim 13, Messerges et al. teaches the method of claim 1, wherein: said presentation component includes an audio speaker system ([0028], [Figure 5])

19. As per claim 14, Messerges et al. teaches a method of presenting content data, comprising:

receiving at a server connected to a hub network a present request indicating locked content data and indicating to a client connected to said hub network to present the content data ([0060-62]);

checking a license corresponding to said locked content data to determine if said license permits said server to present said locked content data through said client ([0060-61] e.g., verifying the package's rights document, hash, and encoded rights table),

wherein said locked content data is a bound instance if said license permits presentation of said locked content data by said server through said client connected to a-the hub network ([0060-63], [0037-38], [0040], [Figure 4] e.g., all devices registered to a domain will be interconnected in that they will have access to content within the domain. Content is cryptographically bound to the domain ID), and

wherein the bound instance of said locked content data and the license corresponding to said locked content data are bound to the hub network ([0060-63], [0037-38], [0040], e.g., content is

Art Unit: 2121

bound to the device domain); and

presenting said locked content data through a presentation component connected to said client when said locked content data is a bound instance ([0059-63], [Figure 3] e.g, before content may be played, the content manager invokes the core digital rights management software)

However, Messerges et al. does not teach the following limitations:

1] wherein the server device is configured to set up the hub network including adding the client and the server device to the hub network.

2] wherein the server device is configured to function as a client in the hub network, and

3] wherein said locked content data is stored on the server device connected to the hub network

Foster et al. teaches 1] ([0080 lines 1-10] e.g., existing devices are both servers and authorizers. This is understood that participating devices function both as server and/or client.)

2] ([0080 line 9-11] e.g., sharing and distributing data)

3] ([0080] lines 9-11))

Therefore, at the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have motivation to modify Messerges as to enable participating devices to function as a server and client, control how many devices are added to the network, and control how content is distributed within the network. The motivation is to implement the teachings of Foster et al. to localize content distribution opposed to requiring a client device to contact an external source for content, as per Messerges. Thus, it is obvious to make integral (e.g., adding, distributing, and authorizing content) content distribution with that of a local network).

authorizing content) content distribution with that of a local network).

However, Messerges et al., as modified, does not teach a) wherein said locked content data is changed to a discrete instance when said locked content data is to be moved to another server

Art Unit: 2121

device bound to another hub network and b) the server device sends a disable request for the locked content data to clients of the hub network to indicate that the bound instance of the locked content data is changed to the discrete instance c) the disable request causes licenses corresponding to the locked content data to be disabled.

Messerges et al. does teach the limitation of when said locked content data is to be moved to another server device bound to another hub network (see Fosters, [0079] e.g., obvious to relocate content to another domain. However, the copy will be disabled, see below, until rights are established via a source for that copy. As applied, a copy would be operable to be bound to another network by requesting such content to be bound, as per the teachings of Messerges, [0037] e.g., binding content to a particular domain);

Claim Limitation part b): *Disable request causes the license corresponding to the locked content data to be disabled*

Chase et al. teaches a license server configured to disable all licenses issued to a user's computing device ([0020], [0279], [0283]. Yaacovi teaches revocation of the original license as a condition of a sale of content whereby such content is stored on a medium ([0011], [0004], [0053]) Messerges et al. teaches multiple user computing devices storing content ([Figure 4]). Messerges et al. further teaches a license file as part of the content package ([Figure 7])

Therefore, at the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have motivation to modify Messerges et al. to permit selling content to another user and disabling all original licenses for the content via a license server. Messerges et al. teaches providing copies of content to multiple domain devices ([Figure 4]). Messerges et al. teaches providing a license file per content package. As applied, it is obvious that a license server would disable the licenses

Art Unit: 2121

for computing devices containing protected content upon the original copy being sold or transferred.

Claim Limitation part a) *said locked content data is changed to a discrete instance when said locked content data is to be moved to another server device bound to another hub network.*

As modified, the content has been transferred, as per Yaacovi, and all licenses for the original content revoked, as per Chase et al. However, this combination does not address whether or not the transferred content is a 'discrete instance.' As interpreted, supra claim interpretation, a new license may be generated that does not associate any domain to the content would be considered domain independent. Chase et al. teaches a license not associated with a domain, i.e., license rights pertaining to distributing content and/or copying ([0004], [0005])

Therefore, at the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have motivation to define a license right independent of any domain. A skilled artisan could readily define the type of rights associated with a license including (but not limited) to copy, distribution, and /or what devices may render the content. In effect, upon transferring or selling an original to another user, a content owner, as per Chase et al., has the ability to define what rights the recipient may receive. In the present case, the rights are silent as to an association with a domain. Furthermore, the transferred content is not subject to control of the prior domain based on a) revoking all prior licenses b) selling the content to another entity and c) a license is silent with regard to any prior association with the originator's domain.

20. As per claim 15, Messerges et al. teaches the method of claim 14, wherein:
streaming data to said client includes streaming locked content data to said client ([0062])

Art Unit: 2121

21. As per claim 16, Messerges et al. teaches the method of claim 14, further comprising:
decrypting said locked content data ([0060])

22. As per claim 17, Messerges et al. teaches the method of claim 14, wherein: said present
request is received from said client ([0042], [0060])

23. As per claim 18, Messerges et al. teaches the method of claim 14, further comprising:
checking a revocation list to determine whether said client is included in said revocation
list ([0073], [0029], [0063-64], e.g., revocation list may be provided via a web server
application);

wherein said revocation list indicates devices for which the license has been revoked, and
wherein said revocation list is stored on said server ([0073] e.g., this functionality may be
provided via a web server)

24. Claims 19-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Messerges
et al. (USPN 20020157002 A1) in view over Russell et al. (20020069420), in view over Foster et
al. (USPN 20030198351) in view over Chase et al. (USPN 20030187801) and in further view
over Yaacovi (USPN 20030018582)

25. As per claim 19, Messerges et al. teaches a method of copying content data, comprising:
receiving in a hub network a request indicating locked content data ([0031], [0045], [0053]
e.g. users may wish to copy newly purchased content packages), ; and

copying said locked content data to produce a copy of said locked content data when said
locked content data is a bound instance with a corresponding license that is bound to said hub
network ([0062] e.g., streaming, copying, loaning, or moving content to other trusted devices);

Art Unit: 2121

wherein the bound instance if said locked content data and the license corresponding to said locked content data are bound to the hub network ([0062-64] e.g., trusted devices are interpreted as belonging to the authorized domain)

However, Messerges et al. does not teach a copy request and copying said locked content data to produce a copy of said locked content data. Messerges teaches said locked content data is a bound instance with a corresponding license that is bound to said hub network ([0062] e.g., streaming, copying, loaning, or moving content to other trusted devices). Messerges teaches a request for locked content data from a content provider ([0042]) Russell et al. teaches a main server containing copy of each content item ([0074], [0080])

Therefore, at the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have motivation to include a server copy of protected content for distribution. Since it is foreseeable that users would request a replacement of content that may have been corrupted, it would be necessary to provide a copy of the original content to the user opposed to sending the original content. Russell et al. illustrates that copies of content are maintained, and therefore it would have been obvious to enable the user to receive a copy of requested content.

However, Messerges et al. does not teach the following limitations:

- 1] wherein the server device is configured to set up the hub network including adding the client and the server device to the hub network.
- 2] wherein the server device is configured to function as a client in the hub network, and

Foster et al. teaches 1] ([0080 lines 1-10] e.g., existing devices are both servers and authorizers. This is understood that participating devices function both as server and/or client.)

2] ([0080 line 9-11] e.g., sharing and distributing data)

Art Unit: 2121

Therefore, at the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have motivation to modify Messerges as to enable participating devices to function as a server and client, control how many devices are added to the network, and control how content is distributed within the network. The motivation is to implement the teachings of Foster et al. to localize content distribution opposed to requiring a client device to contact an external source for content, as per Messerges. Thus, it is obvious to make integral (e.g., adding, distributing, and authorizing content) content distribution with that of a local network).

However, Messerges et al., as modified, does not teach a) wherein said locked content data is changed to a discrete instance when said locked content data is to be moved to another server device bound to another hub network and b) the server device sends a disable request for the locked content data to clients of the hub network to indicate that the bound instance of the locked content data is changed to the discrete instance c) the disable request causes licenses corresponding to the locked content data to be disabled.

Messerges et al. does teach the limitation of when said locked content data is to be moved to another server device bound to another hub network (see Fosters, [0079] e.g., obvious to relocate content to another domain. However, the copy will be disabled, see below, until rights are established via a source for that copy. As applied, a copy would be operable to be bound to another network by requesting such content to be bound, as per the teachings of Messerges, [0037] e.g., binding content to a particular domain);

Claim Limitation part b): *Disable request causes the license corresponding to the locked content data to be disabled*

Art Unit: 2121

Chase et al. teaches a license server configured to disable all licenses issued to a user's computing device ([0020], [0279], [0283]. Yaacovi teaches revocation of the original license as a condition of a sale of content whereby such content is stored on a medium ([0011], [0004], [0053]) Messerges et al. teaches multiple user computing devices storing content ([Figure 4]). Messerges et al. further teaches a license file as part of the content package ([Figure 7])

Therefore, at the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have motivation to modify Messerges et al. to permit selling content to another user and disabling all original licenses for the content via a license server. Messerges et al. teaches providing copies of content to multiple domain devices ([Figure 4]). Messerges et al. teaches providing a license file per content package. As applied, it is obvious that a license server would disable the licenses for computing devices containing protected content upon the original copy being sold or transferred.

Claim Limitation part a) *said locked content data is changed to a discrete instance when said locked content data is to be moved to another server device bound to another hub network.*

As modified, the content has been transferred, as per Yaacovi, and all licenses for the original content revoked, as per Chase et al. However, this combination does not address whether or not the transferred content is a 'discrete instance.' As interpreted, supra claim interpretation, a new license may be generated that does not associate any domain to the content would be considered domain independent. Chase et al. teaches a license not associated with a domain, i.e., license rights pertaining to distributing content and/or copying ([0004], [0005])

Art Unit: 2121

Therefore, at the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have motivation to define a license right independent of any domain. A skilled artisan could readily define the type of rights associated with a license including (but not limited) to copy, distribution, and /or what devices may render the content. In effect, upon transferring or selling an original to another user, a content owner, as per Chase et al., has the ability to define what rights the recipient may receive. In the present case, the rights are silent as to an association with a domain. Furthermore, the transferred content is not subject to control of the prior domain based on a) revoking all prior licenses b) selling the content to another entity and c) a license is silent with regard to any prior association with the originator's domain.

26. As per claim 20, Messerges, as modified, teaches the method of claim 19, further comprising:

checking said license to determine if said license permits said locked content data to be copied ([0007] e.g., users request copies ,[0042], [0049] e.g., it is interpreted that in a digital rights management system that a user is verified prior to being provided digital content. As modified, a copy request would additionally include a verification of a user's permission)

27. As per claim 21 Russell et al, as modified, teaches the method of claim 19, further comprising:

requesting a new license from a server for said copy of said locked content data ([0037] e.g., new license); wherein said server is in said hub network and connected to said client (e.g., Messerges, as modified, teaches providing content to a network such that content is bound to the network. A server providing such content via the network is understood as being in a hub network)

Art Unit: 2121

28. As per claim 22, Messerges et al. teaches the method of claim 19, further comprising: sending said copy of said locked content data to a device that is not a member of said hub network ([0080] e.g., trusted devices outside the domain may be provided content if appropriate content protocol are supplied. As modified, it is interpreted that a content provider may provide copies to a device outside the authorized domain)

29. As per claim 23, Messerges et al. teaches the method of claim 19, further comprising: sending said copy of said locked content data to a client that is a member of said hub network but is not connected to said hub network ([0038], [0040] e.g., a device may receive data bound to a network but may not be physically connected to the network or within range of the domain yet still be a registered member of the domain. For example, a host PC may provide remote download to a device outside of the domain range, i.e., connectivity.)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to provide a host PC to provide content a device outside the immediate domain because such content will not be rendered until the device becomes part of or connected to the authorized domain.

30. As per claim 24, Russell et al. teaches sending a new license to a client that is a member of said hub network but is not connected to said hub network ([0037] e.g., it is interpreted that a new license may be associated with a portable device. [0038], [0040] e.g., a device may receive data bound to a network but may not be physically connected to the network or within range of the domain yet still be a registered member of the domain. For example, a host PC may provide remote download to a device outside of the domain range, i.e., connectivity.)

Art Unit: 2121

Therefore, it would have been obvious to provide a host PC to provide content a device outside the immediate domain because such content will not be rendered until the device becomes part of or connected to the authorized domain.

31. As per claim 25, As per claim 8, Messerges et al. teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising:

checking a revocation list to determine whether said client is included in said revocation list ([0029], [0063-64]);

wherein said revocation list indicates devices for which the license has been revoked, and wherein said revocation list is stored on said client ([0074], [Figure 11- element 1110])

32. As per claim 26, Messerges et al., as modified, teaches a method of distributing content data, comprising:

receiving from a providing device connected to a hub network, and at a receiving device a copy of locked content data that is a bound instance bound to said hub network ([Figure 1], [Figure 5], ([0042], [0049] e.g., requested content, i.e., receiving at a client, a request for locked content data, i.e., encrypted content file)

requesting a new license for said copy of locked content data (e.g., as modified in view of Russell, new license requests and receiving copies could be part of a user request for content.

Please see Russell [0010], [0037], [0074]); and

receiving said new license for said copy of locked content data of the bound instance bound to said hub network (e.g., Messerges teaches binding content to a network, which as modified with Russell, provides that copies of content and associated licenses are bound as well. Please see Messerges ([0060-63], [0037-38], [0040], e.g., content is bound to the device domain);

Art Unit: 2121

wherein the bound instance of said copy of locked content data and the new license corresponding to said copy of locked content data are bound to the hub network (e.g., Messerges teaches [0060-63], [0037-38], [0040], e.g., content is bound to the device domain);

However, Messerges et al. does not teach the following limitations:

1] wherein the providing device is configured to set up the hub network including adding the client and the providing device to the hub network.

2] wherein the providing device is configured to function as a client in the hub network, and

3] wherein said locked content data is stored on the providing device connected to the hub network

Foster et al. teaches 1] ([0080 lines 1-10] e.g., existing devices are both servers and authorizers. This is understood that participating devices function both as server and/or client.)

2] ([0080 line 9-11] e.g., sharing and distributing data)

3] ([0080] lines 9-11))

Therefore, at the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have motivation to modify Messerges as to enable participating devices to function as a server and client, control how many devices are added to the network, and control how content is distributed within the network. The motivation is to implement the teachings of Foster et al. to localize content distribution opposed to requiring a client device to contact an external source for content, as per Messerges. Thus, it is obvious to make integral (e.g., adding, distributing, and authorizing content) content distribution with that of a local network).

However, Messerges et al., as modified, does not teach a) wherein said locked content data is changed to a discrete instance when said locked content data is to be moved to another server device bound to another hub network and b) the server device sends a disable request for

Art Unit: 2121

the locked content data to clients of the hub network to indicate that the bound instance of the locked content data is changed to the discrete instance c) the disable request causes licenses corresponding to the locked content data to be disabled.

Messerges et al. does teach the limitation of when said locked content data is to be moved to another server device bound to another hub network (see Fosters, [0079] e.g., obvious to relocate content to another domain. However, the copy will be disabled, see below, until rights are established via a source for that copy. As applied, a copy would be operable to be bound to another network by requesting such content to be bound, as per the teachings of Messerges, [0037] e.g., binding content to a particular domain);

Claim Limitation part b): *Disable request causes the license corresponding to the locked content data to be disabled*

Chase et al. teaches a license server configured to disable all licenses issued to a user's computing device ([0020], [0279], [0283]. Yaacovi teaches revocation of the original license as a condition of a sale of content whereby such content is stored on a medium ([0011], [0004], [0053]) Messerges et al. teaches multiple user computing devices storing content ([Figure 4]). Messerges et al. further teaches a license file as part of the content package ([Figure 7])

Therefore, at the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have motivation to modify Messerges et al. to permit selling content to another user and disabling all original licenses for the content via a license server. Messerges et al. teaches providing copies of content to multiple domain devices ([Figure 4]). Messerges et al. teaches providing a license file per content package. As applied, it is obvious that a license server would disable the licenses

Art Unit: 2121

for computing devices containing protected content upon the original copy being sold or transferred.

Claim Limitation part a) *said locked content data is changed to a discrete instance when said locked content data is to be moved to another server device bound to another hub network.*

As modified, the content has been transferred, as per Yaacovi, and all licenses for the original content revoked, as per Chase et al. However, this combination does not address whether or not the transferred content is a 'discrete instance.' As interpreted, supra claim interpretation, a new license may be generated that does not associate any domain to the content would be considered domain independent. Chase et al. teaches a license not associated with a domain, i.e., license rights pertaining to distributing content and/or copying ([0004], [0005])

Therefore, at the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have motivation to define a license right independent of any domain. A skilled artisan could readily define the type of rights associated with a license including (but not limited) to copy, distribution, and /or what devices may render the content. In effect, upon transferring or selling an original to another user, a content owner, as per Chase et al., has the ability to define what rights the recipient may receive. In the present case, the rights are silent as to an association with a domain. Furthermore, the transferred content is not subject to control of the prior domain based on a) revoking all prior licenses b) selling the content to another entity and c) a license is silent with regard to any prior association with the originator's domain.

Art Unit: 2121

33. As per claim 27, Russell et al. teaches the method of claim 26, wherein: said providing device is a client in said hub network ([0107] e.g., user may copy and store the copy on another computer)

34. As per claim 28, Messerges et al. teaches the method of claim 26, wherein: said providing device is a server in said hub network ([Figure 2- element 210, 216 (e.g., computer acting as a server in view of Russell)

35. Claims 29-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Messerges et al. (USPN 20020157002 A1), in view over Foster et al. (USPN 20030198351), in view over Russell et al. (20020069420), in view over Chase et al. (USPN 20030187801) in view over Yaacovi (USPN 20030018582) and in further view of Peinado et al. (USPN 20030217011)

36. As per claim 29, Messerges et al., as modified, does not teach said new license is received from said client. Peinado et al. teaches a license store may be embodied in any other form so long as the license store performs the function of storing licenses in a location convenient for the DRM [0132])

Therefore, at the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have motivation to utilize a client as a license store. As a member of an authorized domain, the client is authorized to access protected content. Since several authorized clients are also present within the network, it would have been obvious to use a client as a convenient means of providing a license to another client computer.

37. As per claim 30, Russell et al., as modified, teaches the method of claim 26 wherein said new license is provided from a server in said hub network ([Figure 2- element 12])

Art Unit: 2121

38. As per claim 31, Russell et al., as modified, teaches the method of claim 26 wherein said new license is received from an external server that is not in said hub network ([Figure 2 - element 16])

39. As per claim 32, Messerges et al., as modified, teaches the method of claim 26, wherein said copy of locked content data has a corresponding license authority information stored on said providing device ([Figure 9], [0051], [0059], [0061], [0049] e.g., licensing authority, i.e., digital rights management software implements a content decoder to ask the content package manager to open a package. The content package is associated with a license)

said new license is received from a licensing authority indicated by said licensing authority information (e.g., Messerges et al., as modified by Russell et al, provides the ability to receive a new license. The licensing authority information, i.e., package rights, provides access to such content)

40. As per claim 33, Messerges et al, as modified, teaches the method of claim 26, wherein said receiving device is not a member of said hub network ([0053], [0054] e.g., users may still request content from a provider via a user interface; however, such users outside the domain may not be able to access such content until such devices are registered with the domain)

41. As per claim 34, Messerges et al., as modified, teaches the method of claim 26, wherein said receiving device is a member of a second hub network ([Figure 4 – elements 202₁ 202₂], [0040])

and said new license of said copy of locked content data is bound to said second hub network but not to said hub network ([Figure 4], [0040])

Art Unit: 2121

42. As per claim 35, Messerges et al. teaches the method of claim 26, wherein said receiving device is not connected to said hub network [0038], [0040] e.g., a device may receive data bound to a network but may not be physically connected to the network or within range of the domain yet still be a registered member of the domain. For example, a host PC may provide remote download to a device outside of the domain range, i.e., connectivity.)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to provide a host PC to provide content a device outside the immediate domain because such content will not be rendered until the device becomes part of or connected to the authorized domain.

43. As per claim 36, Messerges et al., as modified, teaches the method of claim 26, further comprising:

checking a revocation list to determine whether said receiving device is included in said revocation list ([0029], [0063-64]);

wherein said revocation list indicates devices for which the license has been revoked, and wherein said revocation list is stored on said receiving device ([0074], [Figure 11- element 1110])

44. As per claim 37, Messerges, as modified, teaches a method of distributing content data, comprising:

receiving at a server connected to a hub network, and from a device a request for a new license for a copy of locked content data that is a bound instance bound to said hub network (e.g., Messerges, as modified by Russell, teaches binding content to a network where a user may request a new copy of content. The copy of the content would be bound to the network. See Messerges [0042-44]. See Russell [0037- providing copies], supra claim 19 discussion);

Art Unit: 2121

checking a root license stored on said server to determine if said root license permits said server to provide a new license for said copy of locked content data of the bound instance ([0042], [0049] content provider, i.e., root server. As modified, a user requesting a new license would be verified as to whether they are permitted access to content. Furthermore, permitting a license to be provided, as taught by Russell, would include checking for payment, i.e., permitting a license to be issued ([0106]) ; and creating said new license according to said root license ([0031], [0042] , [0059], [0061] e.g., providing associated rights and permission. Messerges in view of Russell teaches that users may acquire a new license, where a set usage rules is established. A request for a new license would include usage rule); sending said new license to said device ([0037 (e.g., Russell) teaches downloading a license, i.e., receiving a license), wherein said new license for said copy of locked content data of the bound instance is bound to said hub network ([0060-63], [0037- 38], [0040], [Figure 4] e.g., all devices registered to a domain will be interconnected in that they will have access to content within the domain. Content is cryptographically bound to the domain ID),

wherein the bound instance of said copy of locked content data and the new license are bound to the hub network ([0060-63], [0037-38], [0040], e.g., content is bound to the device domain. It is interpreted that content and associated license/usage rights are bound to the domain, in effect controlling who receives such content, i.e., registered with a domain, and how the content is rendered, i.e., set of usage rules - [0031])

However, Messerges et al. does not teach the following limitations:

1] wherein the providing device is configured to set up the hub network including adding the client and the providing device to the hub network.

2] wherein the providing device is configured to function as a client in the hub network, and

Art Unit: 2121

3] wherein said locked content data is stored on the providing device connected to the hub network

Foster et al. teaches 1] ([0080 lines 1-10] e.g., existing devices are both servers and authorizers. This is understood that participating devices function both as server and/or client.)

2] ([0080 line 9-11] e.g., sharing and distributing data)

3] ([0080] lines 9-11))

Therefore, at the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have motivation to modify Messerges as to enable participating devices to function as a server and client, control how many devices are added to the network, and control how content is distributed within the network. The motivation is to implement the teachings of Foster et al. to localize content distribution opposed to requiring a client device to contact an external source for content, as per Messerges. Thus, it is obvious to make integral (e.g., adding, distributing, and authorizing content) content distribution with that of a local network).

authorizing content) content distribution with that of a local network).

However, Messerges et al., as modified, does not teach a) wherein said locked content data is changed to a discrete instance when said locked content data is to be moved to another server device bound to another hub network and b) the server device sends a disable request for the locked content data to clients of the hub network to indicate that the bound instance of the locked content data is changed to the discrete instance c) the disable request causes licenses corresponding to the locked content data to be disabled.

Messerges et al. does teach the limitation of when said locked content data is to be moved to another server device bound to another hub network (see Fosters, [0079] e.g., obvious to relocate content to another domain. However, the copy will be disabled, see below, until rights are

Art Unit: 2121

established via a source for that copy. As applied, a copy would be operable to be bound to another network by requesting such content to be bound, as per the teachings of Messerges, [0037] e.g., binding content to a particular domain);

Claim Limitation part b): *Disable request causes the license corresponding to the locked content data to be disabled*

Chase et al. teaches a license server configured to disable all licenses issued to a user's computing device ([0020], [0279], [0283]. Yaacovi teaches revocation of the original license as a condition of a sale of content whereby such content is stored on a medium ([0011], [0004], [0053]) Messerges et al. teaches multiple user computing devices storing content ([Figure 4]). Messerges et al. further teaches a license file as part of the content package ([Figure 7])

Therefore, at the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have motivation to modify Messerges et al. to permit selling content to another user and disabling all original licenses for the content via a license server. Messerges et al. teaches providing copies of content to multiple domain devices ([Figure 4]). Messerges et al. teaches providing a license file per content package. As applied, it is obvious that a license server would disable the licenses for computing devices containing protected content upon the original copy being sold or transferred.

Claim Limitation part a) *said locked content data is changed to a discrete instance when said locked content data is to be moved to another server device bound to another hub network.*

As modified, the content has been transferred, as per Yaacovi, and all licenses for the original content revoked, as per Chase et al. However, this combination does not address whether or not

Art Unit: 2121

the transferred content is a 'discrete instance.' As interpreted, supra claim interpretation, a new license may be generated that does not associate any domain to the content would be considered domain independent. Chase et al. teaches a license not associated with a domain, i.e., license rights pertaining to distributing content and/or copying ([0004], [0005])

Therefore, at the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have motivation to define a license right independent of any domain. A skilled artisan could readily define the type of rights associated with a license including (but not limited) to copy, distribution, and /or what devices may render the content. In effect, upon transferring or selling an original to another user, a content owner, as per Chase et al., has the ability to define what rights the recipient may receive. In the present case, the rights are silent as to an association with a domain. Furthermore, the transferred content is not subject to control of the prior domain based on a) revoking all prior licenses b) selling the content to another entity and c) a license is silent with regard to any prior association with the originator's domain.

45. As per claim 38, Messerges, as modified, teaches the method of claim 37, where said device is not connected to said hub network ([0038], [0040] e.g., a device may receive data bound to a network but may not be physically connected to the network or within range of the domain yet still be a registered member of the domain. For example, a host PC may provide remote download to a device outside of the domain range, i.e., connectivity.)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to provide a host PC to provide content a device outside the immediate domain because such content will not be rendered until the device becomes part of or connected to the authorized domain.

Art Unit: 2121

39. As per claim 39, Messerges et al, as modified, teaches the method of claim 5, further comprising:

checking a revocation list to determine whether said client is included in said revocation list ([0073], [0029], [0063-64], e.g., revocation list may be provided via a web server application);

wherein said revocation list indicates devices for which the license has been revoked, and wherein said revocation list is stored on said server device ([0073] e.g., this functionality may be provided via a web server. As applied, to Foster, a participating device functions as both server and authorizer. It is obvious to incorporate the functions of an external server, as per Messerges, into the device server|authorizer, as per Foster)

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Art Unit: 2121

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DARRIN DUNN whose telephone number is (571)270-1645.

The examiner can normally be reached on EST:M-R(8:00-5:00) 9/5/4.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Albert DeCady can be reached on (571) 272-3819. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/DD/

07/29/10

/Charles R Kasenge/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2121